

Orthomodular-valued models for quantum set theory

MASANAO OZAWA

Graduate School of Information Science

Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8601, Japan

Abstract

Orthomodular logic represented by a complete orthomodular lattice has been studied as a pertinent generalization of the two-valued logic, Boolean-valued logic, and quantum logic. In this paper, we introduce orthomodular logic valued models for set theory generalizing quantum logic valued models introduced by Takeuti as well as Boolean-valued models introduced by Scott and Solovay, and prove a general transfer principle that states that every theorem of ZFC set theory without free variable is, if modified by restricting every unbounded quantifier appropriately with the notion of commutators, valid in any orthomodular logic valued models for set theory. This extends the well-known transfer principle for Boolean-valued models. In order to overcome an unsolved problem on the implication in quantum logic, we introduce the notion of generalized implications in orthomodular logic by simple requirements satisfied by the well-known six polynomial implication candidates, and show that for every choice from generalized implications the above transfer principle holds. In view of the close connection between interpretations of quantum mechanics and quantum set theory, this opens an interesting problem as to how the choice of implication affects the interpretation of quantum mechanics.

1 Introduction

Quantum set theory crosses over two different fields of mathematics, namely, foundations of mathematics and foundations of quantum mechanics, and originated from the methods of forcing introduced by Cohen [8, 9] for the independence proof of the continuum hypothesis and quantum logic introduced by Birkhoff and von Neumann [4]. After Cohen's work, the forcing subsequently became a central method in set theory and also incorporated with various notions in mathematics, in particular, the notion of sheaves [11] and notions of sets in nonstandard logics such as Boolean-valued set theory [3], by which Scott and Solovay [24] reformulated the method of forcing, topos [15], and intuitionistic set theory [23]. Quantum set theory was introduced by Takeuti [25] as a successor of those attempts of extending the notion of sets.

Takeuti [25] constructed the universe $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ of set theory based on the standard quantum logic represented by the lattice $\mathcal{Q}$ of closed subspaces of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, in a manner similar to constructing the Boolean-valued universe $V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ from a complete Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$, and showed that each axiom of ZFC can be modified to be a sentence valid in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. It was also revealed that quantum set theory is so irregular that the transitivity law and

the substitution rule for equality do not generally hold without modification. However, the universe of quantum sets includes as submodels many Boolean-valued models in which every axiom of ZFC set theory holds. Takeuti [25] also suggested that the real numbers in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the self-adjoint operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, or equivalently the observables of the quantum system described by $\mathcal{H}$.

In the preceding paper [20], the present author extended Takeuti's quantum set theory to the logic represented by the complete lattice $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ of projections in a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, called a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ in short, and constructed the universe $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ of set theory based on $\mathcal{Q}$. This extension enables us to apply quantum set theory to algebraic quantum field theory [2]. A unified transfer principle was established that states that every theorem of ZFC represented by a Δ_0 -formula is valid up to the truth value determined by the commutator of constants appearing in the formula. Using this transfer principle, real numbers in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ were closely investigated. It was shown that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the real numbers in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and the self-adjoint operators affiliated with the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$. Moreover, it was shown that the equality axioms are satisfied for the real numbers in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and their properties are investigated in detail to show that observational propositions on the physical system described by the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ are embedded in the set theory based on the logic $\mathcal{Q}$.

In the present paper, we construct the ultimate generalization of quantum set theory as follows. First, we generalize the construction of the universe of set theory from the one based on the projection lattice of a von Neumann algebra [20] to the one based on an arbitrary complete orthomodular lattice. Second, we generalize our choice of the implication connective to an arbitrary binary operation satisfying certain general conditions, which hold for the well-known six polynomial candidates [17] of the implication. Third, we generalize the transfer principle to arbitrary theorems of ZFC without restrictions to Δ_0 -formulas.

Birkhoff and von Neumann [5] argued that the departure of quantum logic from classical logic is the failure of the distributive law between conjunction and disjunction, and proposed the modular law for the counter part in quantum logic. Although the modular law does not hold for the standard quantum logic on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space, von Neumann attempted to construct a mathematical formulation of quantum mechanics consistent with the modular law [22] by developing the theory of continuous geometry [29] and the theory of type II_1 von Neumann algebras [19]. However, in the 1960's Araki [1] found that quantum field theory naturally gives rise to a type III von Neumann algebra, so that the quantum logic arising from quantum field theory does not satisfy the modular law. An alternative counter part of the distributive law in quantum logic was found by Husimi [14] in 1937 and is called the orthomodular law. The orthomodular law holds for the projection lattice of every von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, and means that if $P \leq Q$ then P and Q commute. Thus, the class of complete orthomodular lattices, complete orthocomplemented lattices that obey the orthomodular law, includes not only all the complete Boolean algebras but also the projection lattices of all the von Neumann algebras, and has been accepted to be a general setting for quantum logic [16].

In quantum logic there is arbitrariness in choosing a binary operation for the implication among those which coincide with the ordinary implication on Boolean subalgebras. It is known that there are exactly six polynomials that satisfy the above condition. Following Takeuti [25], we in our preceding paper [20] adopted the Sasaki arrow $P \rightarrow Q = P^\perp \vee (P \wedge Q)$,

one of the above six, as the implication.

Here, to treat the most general class of binary operations, we introduce the class of generalized implications in complete orthomodular lattices that is characterized by simple conditions and includes the above six polynomials as only polynomials as well as continuously many non-polynomial operations. We introduce the universe $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ of sets based on a complete orthomodular lattice $\mathcal{Q}$ with a generalized implication, and prove a transfer principle that states that every theorem of ZFC set theory without free variable is valid in the universe $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ for any $\mathcal{Q}$ with any generalized implication, if all unbounded quantifiers are restricted according to appropriate rules using the notion of commutators.

Section 2 collects basic properties of complete orthomodular lattices. Section 3 reviews well-known results on commutators in complete orthomodular lattices. In Section 4, we introduce generalized implications in complete orthomodular lattices and show their basic properties. In Section 5, we show that there are continuously many different generalized implications that are not polynomially definable even in the standard quantum logic. In Section 6, we introduce the universe of sets based on a complete orthomodular lattice with a generalized implication, and show some basic properties. In Section 7, we prove the transfer principle which transfers every theorem of ZFC set theory to a valid sentence for the model.

2 Quantum logic

A *complete orthomodular lattice* is a complete lattice $\mathcal{Q}$ with an *orthocomplementation*, a unary operation $\perp$ on $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying

- (C1) if $P \leq Q$ then $Q^\perp \leq P^\perp$,
- (C2) $P^{\perp\perp} = P$,
- (C3) $P \vee P^\perp = 1$ and $P \wedge P^\perp = 0$,

where $0 = \bigwedge \mathcal{Q}$ and $1 = \bigvee \mathcal{Q}$, that satisfies the *orthomodular law*:

- (OM) if $P \leq Q$ then $P \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q) = Q$.

In this paper, any complete orthomodular lattice is called a *logic*. We refer the reader to Kalmbach [16] for a standard text on orthomodular lattices. In what follows, $P, Q, P_\alpha, \dots$ denote general elements of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$.

The orthomodular law weakens the distributive law, so that any complete Boolean algebra is a logic. The projection lattice $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ of a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a logic [16, p. 69]. The lattice $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$ of closed subspaces of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with the operation of orthogonal complementation is most typically a logic, so-called a standard quantum logic, and is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$, the projection lattice of the algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$ [16, p. 65].

A non-empty subset of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ is called a *sublattice* iff it is closed under $\wedge$ and $\vee$. A sublattice is called a *subalgebra* iff it is further closed under $\perp$. A sublattice or a subalgebra $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ is said to be *complete* iff it has the supremum and the infimum in $\mathcal{Q}$ of an arbitrary subset of $\mathcal{A}$. For any subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$, the sublattice generated by $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $[\mathcal{A}]_0$, the complete sublattice generated by $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $[\mathcal{A}]$, the subalgebra generated by $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\Gamma_0 \mathcal{A}$, and the complete subalgebra generated by $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\Gamma \mathcal{A}$,

We say that P and Q in a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ *commute*, in symbols $P \circ Q$, iff $P = (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge Q^\perp)$. All the relations $P \circ Q$, $Q \circ P$, $P^\perp \circ Q$, $P \circ Q^\perp$, and $P^\perp \circ Q^\perp$ are equivalent. The distributive law does not hold in general, but the following useful propositions [16, pp. 24–25] hold.

Proposition 2.1. *If $P_1, P_2 \circ Q$, then the sublattice generated by P_1, P_2, Q is distributive.*

Proposition 2.2. *If $P_\alpha \circ Q$ for all α , then $\bigvee_\alpha P_\alpha \circ Q$, $\bigwedge_\alpha P_\alpha \circ Q$, $Q \wedge (\bigvee_\alpha P_\alpha) = \bigvee_\alpha (Q \wedge P_\alpha)$, and $Q \vee (\bigwedge_\alpha P_\alpha) = \bigwedge_\alpha (Q \vee P_\alpha)$,*

When applying a distributive law under the assumption of Proposition 2.1, we shall say that we are *focusing* on Q . From Proposition 2.2, a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ is a Boolean algebra if and only if $P \circ Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

For any subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}^!$ the *commutant* of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ [16, p. 23], i.e.,

$$\mathcal{A}^! = \{P \in \mathcal{Q} \mid P \circ Q \text{ for all } Q \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Then, $\mathcal{A}^!$ is a complete orthomodular sublattice of $\mathcal{Q}$, i.e., $\bigwedge \mathcal{S}, \bigvee \mathcal{S}, P^\perp \in \mathcal{A}^!$ for any $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^!$ and $P \in \mathcal{A}^!$. A *sublogic* of $\mathcal{Q}$ is a subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\prime\prime}$. Thus, any sublogic of $\mathcal{Q}$ is a complete subalgebra of $\mathcal{Q}$. For the case where $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{H})$ for a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, a sublogic is characterized as the lattice of projections in a von Neumann algebra acting on $\mathcal{H}$ [20]. For any subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, the smallest logic including $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathcal{A}^{\prime\prime}$ called the *sublogic generated by $\mathcal{A}$* . We have $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mathcal{A}] \subseteq \Gamma\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\prime\prime}$. Then, it is easy to see that subset $\mathcal{A}$ is a Boolean sublogic, or equivalently a distributive sublogic, if and only if $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{\prime\prime} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^!$. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^!$, the subset $\mathcal{A}^{\prime\prime}$ is the smallest Boolean sublogic including $\mathcal{A}$. A subset $\mathcal{A}$ is a maximal Boolean sublogic if and only if $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^!$. By Zorn's lemma, for every subset $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of mutually commuting elements, there is a maximal Boolean sublogic including $\mathcal{A}$.

3 Commutators in quantum logic

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a logic. Marsden [18] has introduced the commutator $\text{com}(P, Q)$ of two elements P and Q of $\mathcal{Q}$ by

$$\text{com}(P, Q) = (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge Q^\perp) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp). \quad (1)$$

Bruns and Kalmbach [6] have generalized this notion to the commutator $\text{com}(\mathcal{F})$ of a finite subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ by

$$\text{com}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigvee_{\alpha: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \{\text{id}, \perp\}} \bigwedge_{P \in \mathcal{F}} P^{\alpha(P)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\{\text{id}, \perp\}$ stands for the set consisting of the identity operation id and the orthocomplementation $\perp$ and for $f \in \{\text{id}, \perp\}$ we write P^f for $f(P)$. Generalizing this notion to an arbitrary subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$, Takeuti [25] has introduced the element $\perp\!\!\!\perp(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$\perp\!\!\!\perp(\mathcal{A}) = \bigvee \{E \in \mathcal{A}^! \mid P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2 \wedge E \text{ for all } P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}\}. \quad (3)$$

Subsequently, Pulmannová [21] has introduced the element $\text{com}(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$\text{com}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigvee \{\text{com}(\mathcal{F}) \mid \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{P}_\omega(\mathcal{A})\}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\omega(\mathcal{A})$ stands for the set of finite subsets of $\mathcal{A}$, and has shown the equivalence between this and Takeuti's notion.

Here, we consider another equivalent notion for the convenience of developing quantum set theory. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$. Note that $\mathcal{A}^{\#}$ is the sublogic generated by $\mathcal{A}$, and $\mathcal{A}^! \cap \mathcal{A}^{\#}$ is the center of $\mathcal{A}^{\#}$. Denote by $L(\mathcal{A})$ the sublogic generated by $\mathcal{A}$, i.e., $L(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}^{\#}$, and by $Z(\mathcal{A})$ the center of $L(\mathcal{A})$, i.e., $Z(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}^! \cap \mathcal{A}^{\#}$. A *subcommutator* of $\mathcal{A}$ is any $E \in Z(\mathcal{A})$ such that $P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2 \wedge E$ for all $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. Denote by $S(\mathcal{A})$ the set of subcommutators of $\mathcal{A}$, i.e.,

$$S(\mathcal{A}) = \{E \in Z(\mathcal{A}) \mid P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2 \wedge E \text{ for all } P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}\}. \quad (5)$$

We shall write $S(P_1, \dots, P_n) = S(\{P_1, \dots, P_n\})$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be any subset of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$. For any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $E \in \mathcal{A}^!$, we have $P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2 \wedge E$ if and only if $P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2$.*

Proof. Let $E \in \mathcal{A}^!$ and $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. We have $(P_1 \wedge E) \wedge (P_2 \wedge E)^{\perp} = (P_1 \wedge E) \wedge P_2^{\perp}$, and hence

$$[(P_1 \wedge E) \wedge (P_2 \wedge E)] \vee [(P_1 \wedge E) \wedge (P_2 \wedge E)^{\perp}] = [(P_1 \wedge E) \wedge P_2] \vee [(P_1 \wedge E) \wedge P_2^{\perp}].$$

It follows that $P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2 \wedge E$ if and only if $P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2$. $\square$

For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, the *interval* $[P, Q]$ is the set of all $X \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $P \leq X \leq Q$. For any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ and $P, Q \in \mathcal{A}$, we write $[P, Q]_{\mathcal{A}} = [P, Q] \cap \mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 3.2. *For any subset $\mathcal{A}$ of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$, we have*

$$S(\mathcal{A}) = \{E \in Z(\mathcal{A}) \mid [0, E]_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq Z(\mathcal{A})\}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $P_1 \wedge E \circ P_2$ for every $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if $[0, E] \cap \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^!$, and hence the assertion follows from Lemma 3.1. $\square$

From the above it is easy to see that for any $E \in S(\mathcal{A})$ the sublogic generated by $\mathcal{A} \wedge E$ is a Boolean sublogic in the center of $\mathcal{A}^{\#}$, i.e.,

$$L(\mathcal{A} \wedge E) \subseteq Z(\mathcal{A}).$$

The *commutator* of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$, is defined as the supremum of $S(\mathcal{A})$, i.e.,

$$\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigvee S(\mathcal{A}). \quad (7)$$

We shall write $\underline{\vee}(P_1, \dots, P_n) = \underline{\vee}(\{P_1, \dots, P_n\})$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subset of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, we have the following statements.*

- (i) $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$ is the maximum subcommutator of $\mathcal{A}$, i.e., $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in S(\mathcal{A})$.
- (ii) $S(\mathcal{A}) = [0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$.
- (iii) $L(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic to the direct product of a complete Boolean algebra $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$ and a complete orthomodular lattice $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})^{\perp}]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$ without non-trivial Boolean factor.

Proof. Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. We have $P_1 \wedge E \downarrow P_2$ for every $E \in S(\mathcal{A})$ from Proposition 3.1, and $P_1 \wedge \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \downarrow P_2$ from Proposition 2.2. Since $S(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq Z(\mathcal{A})$, we have $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in Z(\mathcal{A})$. Thus, $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in S(\mathcal{A})$, and (i) follows. If $P \in [0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$ then $P = P \wedge \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$ commutes with every element of $L(\mathcal{A})$. Thus, we have $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})} = [0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{Z(\mathcal{A})}$. Now, let $E \in [0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{Z(\mathcal{A})}$. Then, $P_1 \downarrow E$ and $P_1 \downarrow P_2 \wedge \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$, and hence $P_1 \downarrow E \wedge P_2 \wedge \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$ and $P_1 \downarrow P_2 \wedge E$. Thus, we have $E \in S(\mathcal{A})$, and (ii) follows. It follows from $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in Z(\mathcal{A})$ that $L(\mathcal{A}) \cong [0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})} \times [0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})^\perp]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$. Then, $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$ is a complete Boolean algebra, since $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{L(\mathcal{A})} \subseteq Z(\mathcal{A})$. It follows easily from the maximality of $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$ that $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})^\perp]_{L(\mathcal{A})}$ has no non-trivial Boolean factor. $\square$

The following theorem is adapted from Pulmannová [21]; see also Chevalier [7].

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subset of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$. The elements $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$, $\underline{\perp}(\mathcal{A})$, $\text{com}(\mathcal{A})$, and $\bigwedge\{\text{com}(P, Q) \mid P, Q \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{A})\}$ are equal.*

Proof. The relation $\underline{\perp}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{com}(\mathcal{A})$ follows from Corollary 1 and Theorem 10 in Ref. [21]. Since $\text{com}(\mathcal{F}) \in Z(\mathcal{F})$ for every finite subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{A}$, we have $\text{com}(\mathcal{A}) \in Z(\mathcal{A})$, and hence we have $\underline{\perp}(\mathcal{A}) \in Z(\mathcal{A})$. Thus, the relation $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) = \underline{\perp}(\mathcal{A})$ follows. The relation $\text{com}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigwedge\{\text{com}(P, Q) \mid P, Q \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{A})\}$ follows from Theorem 7 of Ref. [21] $\square$

The following proposition will be useful in later discussions.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a maximal Boolean sublogic of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ a subset of $\mathcal{Q}$ including $\mathcal{B}$, i.e., $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$. Then, we have $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. Since $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in Z(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^\perp = \mathcal{B}$, we have $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $P \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, $P \wedge \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \downarrow Q$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{B}$, so that $P \wedge \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{B}^\perp = \mathcal{B}$, and hence $[0, \underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})]_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. $\square$

4 Generalized implications in quantum logic

In classical logic, the implication connective $\rightarrow$ is defined by negation $\perp$ and disjunction $\vee$ as $P \rightarrow Q = P^\perp \vee Q$. In quantum logic, several counterparts have been proposed. Hardegree [12] proposed the following requirements for the implication connective.

- (E) $P \rightarrow Q = 1$ if and only if $P \leq Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (MP) $P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \leq Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (MT) $Q^\perp \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \leq P^\perp$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (NG) $P \wedge Q^\perp \leq (P \rightarrow Q)^\perp$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (LB) If $P \downarrow Q$, then $P \rightarrow Q = P^\perp \vee Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

The work of Kotas [17] can be applied to the problem as to what ortholattice-polynomials $P \rightarrow Q$ satisfy the above conditions; see also [12] and [16]. There are exactly six two-variable ortholattice-polynomials satisfying (LB), defined as follows.

- (0) $P \rightarrow_0 Q = P^\perp \vee Q$.
- (1) $P \rightarrow_1 Q = (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge (P^\perp \vee Q))$.
- (2) $P \rightarrow_2 Q = ((P^\perp \vee Q) \wedge Q^\perp) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge Q)$.
- (3) $P \rightarrow_3 Q = P^\perp \vee (P \wedge Q)$.
- (4) $P \rightarrow_4 Q = (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp) \vee Q$.

$$(5) P \rightarrow_5 Q = (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge Q).$$

It is also verified that requirement (E) is satisfied by $\rightarrow_j$ for $j=1, \dots, 5$ and that all requirements (E), (MP), (MT), (NG), and (LB) are satisfied by $\rightarrow_j$ for $j=3, 4, 5$.

We call $\rightarrow_0$ the *maximum implication*, $\rightarrow_3$ the *Sasaki arrow*, $\rightarrow_4$ the *contrapositive Sasaki arrow*, $\rightarrow_5$ the *minimum implication*. So far we have no general agreement on the choice from the above, although the majority view favors the Sasaki arrow [28].

In quantum set theory, the truth values of atomic formulas, $\llbracket u \in v \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket u = v \rrbracket$, depend crucially on the definition of the implication connective. Takeuti [25] and the present author [20] previously chose the Sasaki arrow for this purpose. However, there are several reasons for investigating wider choices of the implication connective. To mention one of them, consider the de Morgan law for bounded quantifiers in set theory:

$$\llbracket \neg(\exists x \in u)\phi(x) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\forall x \in u)\neg\phi(x) \rrbracket.$$

The validity of this fundamental law depends on the choice of the implication connective $\rightarrow$, since the right-hand-side is determined by

$$\llbracket (\forall x \in u)\neg\phi(x) \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(u)} u(x) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(x) \rrbracket^\perp,$$

whereas the left-hand-side is determined by the original lattice operations as

$$\llbracket \neg(\exists x \in u)\phi(x) \rrbracket = \left(\bigvee_{x \in \mathcal{D}(u)} u(x) \wedge \llbracket \phi(x) \rrbracket \right)^\perp.$$

Remarkably, our previous choice, the Sasaki arrow, does not satisfy this law, while only the maximum implication satisfies it. Thus, we have at least one logical principle that prefers the maximum implication which has been rather excluded because of its failure in satisfying (E), (MP), or (MT). In this paper, we develop a quantum set theory based on a very general choice of implication to answer the question what properties of the implication ensures the transfer principle for quantum set theory.

A binary operation $\rightarrow$ on a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ is called a *generalized implication* if the following conditions hold.

- (I1) $P \rightarrow Q \in \{P, Q\}^{\perp\perp}$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (I2) $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge E = [(P \wedge E) \rightarrow (Q \wedge E)] \wedge E$ if $P, Q \perp E$ for all $P, Q, E \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (I3) The operation $\rightarrow$ satisfies (LB).

The following proposition shows that any polynomially definable binary operation $\rightarrow$ satisfies (I1) and (I2).

Proposition 4.1. *Let f be a two-variable ortholattice polynomial on $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, we have the following statements.*

- (i) $f(P, Q) \in \{P, Q\}^{\perp\perp}$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (ii) $f(P, Q) \wedge E = f(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E) \wedge E$ if $P, Q \perp E$ for all $P, Q, E \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. Since $f(P, Q) \in \Gamma_0\{P, G\} \subseteq \{P, Q\}^{\perp\perp}$, statement (i) follows. The proof of (ii) is carried out by induction on the complexity of the polynomial $f(P, Q)$. First, note that from $P, Q \downarrow E$ we have $g(P, Q) \downarrow E$ for any two-variable polynomial g . If $f(P, Q) = P$ or $f(P, Q) = Q$, assertion (ii) holds obviously. If $f(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \wedge g_2(P, Q)$ with two-variable polynomials g_1, g_2 , the assertion holds from associativity. Suppose that $f(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \vee g_2(P, Q)$ with two-variable polynomials g_1, g_2 . Since $g_1(P, Q), g_2(P, Q) \downarrow E$, the assertion follows from the distributive law focusing on E . Suppose $f(P, Q) = g(P, Q)^\perp$ with a two-variable polynomial g . For the case where g is atomic, the assertion follows; for instance, if $g(P, Q) = P$, we have $f(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E) \wedge E = (P \wedge E)^\perp \wedge E = (P^\perp \vee E^\perp) \wedge E = P^\perp \wedge E = f(P, Q) \wedge E$. Then, we assume $g(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \wedge g_2(P, Q)$ or $g(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \vee g_2(P, Q)$ with two-variable polynomials g_1, g_2 . If $g(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \wedge g_2(P, Q)$, by the induction hypothesis and the distributivity we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(P, Q) \wedge E &= g(P, Q)^\perp \wedge E \\
&= (g_1(P, Q)^\perp \vee g_2(P, Q)^\perp) \wedge E \\
&= (g_1(P, Q)^\perp \wedge E) \vee (g_2(P, Q)^\perp \wedge E) \\
&= (g_1(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E)^\perp \wedge E) \vee (g_2(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E)^\perp \wedge E) \\
&= (g_1(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E)^\perp \vee g_2(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E)^\perp) \wedge E \\
&= (g_1(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E) \wedge g_2(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E))^\perp \wedge E \\
&= g(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E)^\perp \wedge E \\
&= f(P \wedge E, Q \wedge E) \wedge E.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the assertion follows if $g(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \wedge g_2(P, Q)$, and similarly the assertion follows if $g(P, Q) = g_1(P, Q) \vee g_2(P, Q)$. Thus, the assertion generally follows from the induction on the complexity of the polynomial f . $\square$

Let $\mathcal{L} = \{P, Q\}^{\perp\perp}$. Then, $[0, \underline{\vee}(P, Q)]$ is a complete Boolean algebra with relative orthocomplement $X^c = X^\perp \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)$. From Proposition 3.3, any $X \in \mathcal{L}$ is uniquely decomposed as $X = X_B \vee X_N$ with the condition that $X_B \leq \underline{\vee}(P, Q)$ and $X_N \leq \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp$. Since $P^\alpha \wedge Q^\beta \leq \underline{\vee}(P, Q)$ and $\underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp \leq P^\alpha \vee Q^\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \{\text{id}, \perp\}$, we have

$$(P^\alpha)_B \wedge (Q^\beta)_B = (P^\alpha \wedge Q^\beta)_B = P^\alpha \wedge Q^\beta, \quad (8)$$

$$(P^\alpha)_N \wedge (Q^\beta)_N = (P^\alpha \wedge Q^\beta)_N = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$(P^\alpha)_B \vee (Q^\beta)_B = (P^\alpha \vee Q^\beta)_B = \bigvee_{\alpha': \alpha' \neq \alpha; \beta': \beta' \neq \beta} (P^{\alpha'} \wedge Q^{\beta'}), \quad (10)$$

$$(P^\alpha)_N \vee (Q^\beta)_N = (P^\alpha \vee Q^\beta)_N = \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp. \quad (11)$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\rightarrow$ be a binary operation satisfying (I1) and (I2). Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\rightarrow$ is a generalized implication, or satisfies (LB).
- (ii) $(P \rightarrow Q)_B = P \rightarrow_5 Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (iii) $(P \rightarrow Q) \vee \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp = P \rightarrow_0 Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.
- (iv) $P \rightarrow_5 Q \leq P \rightarrow Q \leq P \rightarrow_0 Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. Suppose (LB) is satisfied. Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Since $P_B \downarrow Q_B$, we have $P_B \rightarrow Q_B = P_B^\perp \vee Q_B$ and $(P_B^\perp \vee Q_B) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = (P^\perp \vee Q) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = P \rightarrow_5 Q$. Thus, from (I2) we have

$$(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = (P_B \rightarrow Q_B) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = P \rightarrow_5 Q,$$

and hence (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) follows. Suppose (ii) holds. We have $P \rightarrow_5 Q \leq P \rightarrow Q$. By taking the join with $\underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp$ in the both sides of relation (ii), we have $P \rightarrow Q \vee \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp = P \rightarrow_5 Q \vee \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp$. Since $P \rightarrow_5 Q \vee \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp = P \rightarrow_0 Q$ by calculation, we obtain (iii), and the implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) follows. Suppose (iii) holds. Then, $P \rightarrow Q \leq P \rightarrow_0 Q$. By taking the meet with $\underline{\vee}(P, Q)$ in the both sides of (iii), we have $P \rightarrow Q \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = P \rightarrow_0 Q \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = P \rightarrow_5 Q$, and hence $P \rightarrow_5 Q \leq P \rightarrow Q$. Thus, the implication (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) follows. Suppose (iv) holds. If $P \downarrow Q$, we have $P \rightarrow_5 Q = P \rightarrow_0 Q = P^\perp \vee Q$, so that $P \rightarrow Q = P^\perp \vee Q$. Thus, the implication (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) follows, and the proof is completed. $\square$

Polynomially definable generalized implications are characterized as follows.

Proposition 4.3. *Polynomially definable generalized implications are only six binary operations $\rightarrow_j$ for $j = 0, \dots, 5$. In particular, they satisfy the following relations for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.*

- (i) $P \rightarrow_0 Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp$.
- (ii) $P \rightarrow_1 Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (P \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.
- (iii) $P \rightarrow_2 Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (Q^\perp \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.
- (iv) $P \rightarrow_3 Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (P^\perp \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.
- (v) $P \rightarrow_4 Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (Q \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.

Proof. From Proposition 4.1 and Kotas's result [17] mentioned above, it follows easily that polynomially definable generalized implications are only six binary operations $\rightarrow_j$ for $j = 0, \dots, 5$. From Proposition 4.2, we have $(P \rightarrow_j Q)_B = P \rightarrow_5 Q$. Relations (i)–(v) can be easily obtained by the relation $(P \rightarrow_j Q)_N = (P \rightarrow_j Q) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp$. $\square$

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\rightarrow$ be a generalized implication on a logic $\mathcal{Q}$ and let $P, P_1, P_2, P_{1,\alpha}, P_{2,\alpha}, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (i) $P \rightarrow Q = 1$ if $P \leq Q$.
- (ii) $(\bigwedge_\alpha P_{1,\alpha} \rightarrow P_{2,\alpha}) \wedge Q = (\bigwedge_\alpha (P_{1,\alpha} \wedge Q) \rightarrow (P_{2,\alpha} \wedge Q)) \wedge Q$ if $P_{1,\alpha}, P_{2,\alpha} \downarrow Q$.

Proof. If $P \leq Q$, then $P \downarrow Q$ and $P \rightarrow Q = P^\perp \vee Q = 1$, so that statement (i) follows. Statement (ii) follows from the definition of generalized implications and Proposition 2.2. $\square$

Generalized implications satisfying (MP) are characterized as follows.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\rightarrow$ be a generalized implication on a logic $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\rightarrow$ satisfies (MP).
- (ii) $P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)_N = 0$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. Suppose that (MP) holds. Then, we have $P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \leq P \wedge Q$ and hence

$$P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)_N \leq P \wedge Q \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp = 0.$$

Thus, (ii) holds. Conversely, suppose that a generalized implication $\rightarrow$ satisfies (ii). Since $P \rightarrow Q \in \{P, Q\}^\dagger$, we have $P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) = (P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)_B) \vee (P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q)_N) = P \wedge (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \leq Q$ from Proposition 4.2 (ii). Thus, (MP) holds, and the proof is completed. $\square$

The following characterization of polynomially definable generalized implications satisfying (MP) was given by Hardegree [12].

Corollary 4.6. *Polynomially definable generalized implications satisfying (MP) are only four binary operations $\rightarrow_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, 5$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P \wedge (P \rightarrow_0 Q)_N &= P \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp = P_N, \\ P \wedge (P \rightarrow_1 Q)_N &= P \wedge P_N = P_N, \\ P \wedge (P \rightarrow_2 Q)_N &= P \wedge Q_N^\perp = (P \wedge Q^\perp)_N = 0, \\ P \wedge (P \rightarrow_3 Q)_N &= P \wedge P_N^\perp = (P \wedge P^\perp)_N = 0, \\ P \wedge (P \rightarrow_4 Q)_N &= P \wedge Q_N = (P \wedge Q)_N = 0, \\ P \wedge (P \rightarrow_5 Q)_N &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and the assertion follows from Proposition 4.5. $\square$

The above four implications are mutually characterized as follows.

Proposition 4.7. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a logic. For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have the following relations.*

- (i) $X \leq P \rightarrow_3 Q$ if and only if $P \wedge (P \rightarrow_0 X) \leq Q$.
- (ii) $P \rightarrow_3 Q = \max\{X \in \{P\}^\dagger \mid P \wedge X \leq Q \wedge X\}$.
- (iii) $P \rightarrow_4 Q = Q^\perp \rightarrow_3 P^\perp$.
- (iv) $P \rightarrow_4 Q = \max\{X \in \{Q\}^\dagger \mid Q^\perp \wedge X \leq P^\perp \wedge X\}$.
- (v) $P \rightarrow_5 Q = (P \rightarrow_3 Q) \wedge (P \rightarrow_4 Q)$.
- (vi) $P \rightarrow_5 Q = \max\{X \in \{P, Q\}^\dagger \mid P \wedge X \leq Q \wedge X\}$.

Proof. For the proof of (i), see for example [13]. Since $P^\perp \leq (P \rightarrow_3 Q)$, we have $(P \rightarrow_3 Q) \circ P$, and from (MP) we have $P \rightarrow_3 Q \in \{X \in \{P\}^\dagger \mid P \wedge X \leq Q\}$. If $X \circ P$ and $P \wedge X \leq Q$, we have

$$X = (X \wedge P) \vee (X \wedge P^\perp) \leq (P \wedge Q) \vee P^\perp = P \rightarrow_3 Q.$$

Therefore, relation (ii) is concluded. Relations (iii) and (iv) are obvious. For the proof of (v), see for example [16, p. 246]. Since $P \wedge Q, P^\perp \wedge Q, P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp \in \{P, Q\}^\dagger$, we have $P \rightarrow_5 Q \in \{P, Q\}^\dagger$. From (ii), we have $P \wedge (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \leq P \wedge (P \rightarrow_3 Q) \leq Q$, so that $P \rightarrow_5 Q \in \{X \in \{P, Q\}^\dagger \mid P \wedge X \leq Q\}$. Let $X \in \{P, Q\}^\dagger$ and $P \wedge X \leq Q$. By de Morgan, $Q^\perp \leq P^\perp \vee X^\perp$. Since $P \circ X$, we have

$$Q^\perp \wedge X \leq (P^\perp \vee X^\perp) \wedge X = X \wedge P^\perp \leq P^\perp.$$

Thus, by (iv) we have $X \leq P \rightarrow_4 Q$. We have also $X \leq P \rightarrow_3 Q$ from (ii), so that we have $X \leq P \rightarrow_5 Q$. Thus, relation (vi) follows. $\square$

Theorem 4.8 (Deduction Theorem). *Let $\rightarrow$ be a generalized implication on a logic $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (i) *For any $X \in \{P, Q\}^!$, if $P \wedge X \leq Q$, then $X \leq P \rightarrow Q$.*
- (ii) *For any $X \in \{P, Q\}^!$, we have $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge P \wedge X \leq Q$ if and only if $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge X \leq P \rightarrow Q$.*
- (iii) *$\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge P \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) \leq Q$.*

Proof. From Proposition 4.7 (vi), for any $X \in \{P, Q\}^!$, we have $P \wedge X \leq Q \wedge X$ if and only if $X \leq P \rightarrow_5 Q$. It is easy to see that $P \wedge X \leq Q \wedge X$ if and only if $P \wedge X \leq Q$. Thus, we have $P \wedge X \leq Q$ if and only if $X \leq P \rightarrow_5 Q$, and assertion (i) follows from $P \rightarrow_5 Q \leq P \rightarrow Q$. By substituting X by $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge X$, we have $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge P \wedge X \leq Q$ if and only if $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge X \leq P \rightarrow_5 Q$. Then, it is easy to see that $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge X \leq P \rightarrow Q$, since $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge P \rightarrow Q = P \rightarrow_5 Q$. Thus, assertion (ii) follows. Assertion (iii) follows from (ii) with $X = \underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge (P \rightarrow Q) = P \rightarrow_5 Q \in \{P, Q\}$. $\square$

Associated with a generalized implication $\rightarrow$ we define the *logical equivalence* by $P \leftrightarrow Q = (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P)$. A generalized implication $\rightarrow$ is said to satisfy (LE) if $P \leftrightarrow Q = (P \wedge Q) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp)$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\rightarrow$ be a generalized implication on $\mathcal{Q}$. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *(LE) is satisfied.*
 - (ii) *$P \leftrightarrow Q = \max\{X \in \{P, Q\}^! \mid P \wedge X = Q \wedge X\}$.*
 - (iii) *$P \leftrightarrow Q \leq \underline{\vee}(P, Q)$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.*
- In this case, we have*
- (iv) *$P \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q) \leq Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.*
 - (v) *$(P \leftrightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \leftrightarrow R) \leq P \leftrightarrow R$ for all $P, Q, R \in \mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Suppose $P \leftrightarrow Q = (P \wedge Q) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp)$. It is easy to see that $P \leftrightarrow Q \in \{X \in \{P, Q\}^! \mid P \wedge X = Q \wedge X\}$. Let $X \in \{P, Q\}^!$ be such that $P \wedge X = Q \wedge X$. Then, we have $X \wedge P = X \wedge P \wedge Q$. From $P \wedge X = Q \wedge X$, we have $P^\perp \vee X^\perp = Q^\perp \vee X^\perp$, and hence

$$X \wedge P^\perp = X \wedge (P^\perp \vee X^\perp) = X \wedge (Q^\perp \vee X^\perp) = X \wedge Q^\perp.$$

Thus, we have $X \wedge P^\perp = X \wedge P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp$, and hence $X = (X \wedge P) \vee (X \wedge P^\perp) = X \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q)$. This concludes $X \leq (P \leftrightarrow Q)$ and relation (ii) follows from relation (i).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). Suppose $P \leftrightarrow Q = \max\{X \in \{P, Q\}^! \mid P \wedge X = Q \wedge X\}$. Then, $P \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q) = Q \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q)$ and hence $P \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q) \leq Q \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q)$. Thus, $P \leftrightarrow Q$ is a subcommutator of $\{P, Q\}$, and hence $P \leftrightarrow Q \leq \underline{\vee}(P, Q)$.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). Suppose $P \leftrightarrow Q \leq \underline{\vee}(P, Q)$. Then, we have $P \leftrightarrow Q = P \leftrightarrow Q \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P) \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q) = P \rightarrow_5 Q \wedge Q \rightarrow_5 P = (P \wedge Q) \vee (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp)$.

Proof of (iv). From (ii), we have $P \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q) = Q \wedge (P \leftrightarrow Q) \leq Q$, and the assertion follows.

Proof of (v). Let $P, Q, R \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $E = P \leftrightarrow Q$ and $F = Q \leftrightarrow R$. From (ii) we have $P \wedge E = Q \wedge E$ and $Q \wedge F = R \wedge F$, so that $P \wedge E \wedge F = R \wedge E \wedge F$. From (ii) we have $Q \leq E, F$, so that $Q \leq E \wedge F$. Since $E \leq E \wedge F$, we have $Q \wedge E \leq E \wedge F$. Since $P \wedge E = Q \wedge E$,

we have $P \wedge E \circ E \wedge F$. It is obvious that $P \wedge E^\perp \circ E \wedge F$. Since $P \circ E$, we have $P \circ E \wedge F$. Similarly, we have $R \circ E \wedge F$. Thus, from (ii) we have $E \wedge F \leq P \leftrightarrow R$, and relation (v) is obtained. $\square$

The following characterization of polynomially definable generalized implications satisfying (LE) was given by Hardegree [12].

Corollary 4.10. *Polynomially definable generalized implications satisfying (LE) are only five binary operations $\rightarrow_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, 5$.*

Proof. From $(P \leftrightarrow_j Q)_N = (P \rightarrow_j Q)_N \wedge (Q \rightarrow_j P)_N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P \leftrightarrow_0 Q)_N &= \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp, \\ (P \leftrightarrow_1 Q)_N &= P_N \wedge Q_N = (P \wedge Q)_N = 0, \\ (P \leftrightarrow_2 Q)_N &= Q_N^\perp \wedge P_N^\perp = (Q^\perp \wedge P^\perp)_N = 0, \\ (P \leftrightarrow_3 Q)_N &= P_N^\perp \wedge Q_N^\perp = (P^\perp \wedge Q^\perp)_N = 0, \\ (P \leftrightarrow_4 Q)_N &= Q_N \wedge P_N = (Q \wedge P)_N = 0, \\ (P \leftrightarrow_5 Q)_N &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 4.9, the generalized implication $\rightarrow_j$ satisfies (LE) if and only if $(P \leftrightarrow_j Q)_N = 0$, and the assertion follows. $\square$

5 Non-polynomial implications in quantum logic

In the preceding section, we introduced the notion of generalized implications. In this section, we shall show that there are continuously many generalized implications other than the polynomially definable six generalized implications.

Bruns-Kalmbach [6] determined the structure of the subalgebra $\Gamma_0\{P, Q\}$ generated by $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ to be isomorphic to the direct product of a Boolean algebra and MO2, the Chinese lantern [16, p. 16]; see also Ref. [16, P. 27]. In this case, $\Gamma_0\{P, Q\}$ is a complete subalgebra so that $\Gamma_0\{P, Q\} = \Gamma\{P, Q\}$, and $[0, \underline{\vee}(P, Q)]_{\Gamma\{P, Q\}}$ is a Boolean algebra and $[0, \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp]_{\Gamma\{P, Q\}}$ is isomorphic to MO2. However, the structure of $\{P, Q\}^{\text{!}}$ is more involved. For the projection lattice $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M})$ of a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, the sublogic $\{P, Q\}^{\text{!}}$ is the projection lattice of the von Neumann algebra $\{P, Q\}^{\text{''}}$ generated by $\{P, Q\}$ [20]. For example, let $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}))$ be rank one projections on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then, we have $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) = 1$ or $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) = 0$. If $P = Q$ or $P \perp Q$, then $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) = 1$ and $\{P, Q\}^{\text{!}} = \Gamma\{P, Q\}$ is a complete Boolean subalgebra of $\mathcal{Q}$. Otherwise, $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) = 0$ and $\{P, Q\}^{\text{!}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^2))$, but $\Gamma\{P, Q\}$ is a 6-element subalgebra of $\{P, Q\}^{\text{!}}$ isomorphic to MO2.

On the projection lattice $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M})$ of a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, define a binary operation $\circ_\theta$ on $\mathcal{Q}$ by

$$P \circ_\theta Q = e^{i\theta P} Q e^{-i\theta P} \quad (12)$$

for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. If $P \circ Q$, then we have $P \circ_\theta Q = Q$. We have

$$P \circ_\theta Q = Q + (e^{i\theta} - 1)PQ + (e^{-i\theta} - 1)QP + 2(1 - \cos \theta)PQP \quad (13)$$

for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and this was first introduced by Takeuti [25] for $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$. Then, the binary operation $f(P, Q) = P \circ_\theta Q$ satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 4.1. However, it is not in general be definable as a lattice polynomial, since $f(P, Q)$ is not generally in $\Gamma\{P, Q\}$.

Now, for index $j = 0, \dots, 5$, real parameter $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $i = 0, 1$, we define binary operations $\rightarrow_{j,\theta,i}$ on $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M})$ by

$$P \rightarrow_{j,\theta,0} Q = P \rightarrow_j (P \circ_\theta Q) \quad (14)$$

$$P \rightarrow_{j,\theta,1} Q = (Q \circ_\theta P) \rightarrow_j Q \quad (15)$$

for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Obviously, $\rightarrow_{j,0,i} = \rightarrow_j$ for $j = 0, \dots, 5$ and $i = 0, 1$.

Proposition 5.1. *For any von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, the binary operations $\rightarrow_{j,\theta,i}$ on $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M})$ for $j = 0, \dots, 5$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $i = 0, 1$ are generalized implications. In particular, they satisfy the following relations for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$.*

- (i) $P \rightarrow_{0,\theta,0} Q = P \rightarrow_{0,\theta,1} Q = P \rightarrow_0 Q$.
- (ii) $P \rightarrow_{1,\theta,0} Q = P \rightarrow_1 Q$.
- (iii) $P \rightarrow_{2,\theta,1} Q = P \rightarrow_2 Q$.
- (iv) $P \rightarrow_{3,\theta,0} Q = P \rightarrow_3 Q$.
- (v) $P \rightarrow_{4,\theta,1} Q = P \rightarrow_4 Q$.
- (vi) $P \rightarrow_{5,\theta,0} Q = P \rightarrow_{5,\theta,1} Q = P \rightarrow_5 Q$.
- (vii) $P \rightarrow_{1,\theta,1} Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (Q \circ_\theta P \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.
- (viii) $P \rightarrow_{2,\theta,0} Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (P \circ_\theta Q^\perp \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.
- (ix) $P \rightarrow_{3,\theta,1} Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (Q \circ_\theta P^\perp \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.
- (x) $P \rightarrow_{4,\theta,0} Q = (P \rightarrow_5 Q) \vee (P \circ_\theta Q \wedge \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp)$.

Proof. To prove (i) note that $(P \circ_\theta Q)_B = Q_B$; since $e^{i\theta P}$ commutes with $\underline{\vee}(P, Q)$, we have $(P \circ_\theta Q)_B = P \circ_\theta Q_B = Q_B$. Thus, we have $(P \rightarrow_{0,\theta,0} Q)_B = (P \rightarrow_0 Q)_B = P \rightarrow_5 Q$. On the other hand, we have

$$(P \rightarrow_{0,\theta,0} Q)_N = P \circ_\theta (P \rightarrow_0 Q)_N = P \circ_\theta \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp = \underline{\vee}(P, Q)^\perp.$$

Thus, $P \rightarrow_{0,\theta,0} Q = P \rightarrow_0 Q$. Similarly, we have $P \rightarrow_{0,\theta,1} Q = P \rightarrow_0 Q$, and (i) follows. Relations (ii)–(vi) can be verified by similar arguments. We have

$$(P \rightarrow_{1,\theta,1} Q)_B = Q \circ_\theta (P \rightarrow_1 Q)_B = Q \circ_\theta (P \rightarrow_5 Q) = P \rightarrow_5 Q.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$(P \rightarrow_{1,\theta,1} Q)_N = Q \circ_\theta (P \rightarrow_1 Q)_N = Q \circ_\theta P_N = (Q \circ_\theta P)_N.$$

Thus, relation (vii) follows. Relations (viii)–(x) can be verified by similar calculations. The operations $\rightarrow_j$ with $j = 0, \dots, 5$ are ortholattice polynomial, so that they satisfy (I1) and (I2). Since the binary operation $f(P, Q) = P \circ_\theta Q$ satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 4.1, it is easy to see that the operations $\rightarrow_{j,\theta,i}$ with $j = 0, \dots, 5$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $i = 0, 1$ satisfy (I1) and (I2). Thus, with relations (i)–(x), the assertion follows from Proposition 4.2. $\square$

In what follows, for any two vectors ξ, η in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ the operator $|\xi\rangle\langle\eta|$ is defined by $|\xi\rangle\langle\eta|\psi = \langle\eta|\psi\rangle\xi$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, where $\langle\cdots|\cdots\rangle$ stands for the inner product of $\mathcal{H}$ that is assumed to be linear in the second variable. If ξ or η are denoted by $|a\rangle$ or $|b\rangle$, respectively, as customarily in quantum mechanics [10], the inner product $\langle\xi|\eta\rangle$ is also denoted by $\langle a|b\rangle$, $\langle a|\eta\rangle$, or $\langle\xi|b\rangle$, and the operator $|\xi\rangle\langle\eta|$ is also denoted by $|a\rangle\langle b|$, $|a\rangle\langle\eta|$, or $|\xi\rangle\langle b|$.

Proposition 5.2. *Generalized implications $\rightarrow_{1,\theta,1}$, $\rightarrow_{2,\theta,0}$, $\rightarrow_{3,\theta,1}$, and $\rightarrow_{4,\theta,0}$ are not polynomially definable for any $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{C}^2)$ and $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ be a complete orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{C}^2$. Let $\phi = (1/2)(|0\rangle + \sqrt{3}|1\rangle)$. Let $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$. Let $P = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, and $Q = |1\rangle\langle 1|$. Then, we have $Q \circ_\theta P = |\phi(\theta)\rangle\langle\phi(\theta)|$ where $\phi(\theta) = (1/2)(|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}\sqrt{3}|1\rangle)$. Since $\langle 1|\phi\rangle = \sqrt{3}/2$, we have $\underline{\vee}(P, Q) = 0$. Thus, we have

$$P \rightarrow_{1,\theta,1} Q = Q \circ_\theta P = |\phi(\theta)\rangle\langle\phi(\theta)|.$$

Since $\langle\phi|\phi(\theta)\rangle = (1 + 3e^{i\theta})/4$ and $\langle 1|\phi(\theta)\rangle = \sqrt{3}e^{i\theta}/2$, it follows that $P \circ_\theta Q$ is not an element of $\{0, P, P^\perp, Q, Q^\perp, 1\}$. Since the subalgebra $\Gamma\{P, Q\}$ generated by P, Q is a Chinese lantern $\{0, P, P^\perp, Q, Q^\perp, 1\}$, we conclude that there is no ortholattice polynomial $f(P, Q)$ such that $f(P, Q) = P \rightarrow_{1,\theta,1} Q$ holds in any $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M})$. The rest of the assertion can be proved similarly. $\square$

Proposition 5.3. *For any von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{M}$, the binary operations $\rightarrow_{j,\theta,i}$ on $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{M})$ with $j = 2, \dots, 5$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $i = 0, 1$ but $(j, i) \neq (3, 1)$ satisfy (MP).*

Proof. For $(j, i) = (2, 1), (3, 0), (4, 1), (5, 0), (5, 1)$, we have $\rightarrow_{j,\theta,i} = \rightarrow_j$, and hence the assertion follows from Proposition 4.6. For $(j, i) = (2, 0)$, we have

$$P \wedge (P \rightarrow_{2,\theta,0} Q)_N = P \wedge (P \circ_\theta Q^\perp)_N = P \circ_\theta (P \wedge Q^\perp)_N = 0,$$

and hence $\rightarrow_{2,\theta,0}$ satisfies (MP) by Proposition 4.5. For $(j, i) = (4, 0)$ the assertion can be verified analogously. $\square$

6 Universe of quantum sets

In this section, let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a logic with a generalized implication $\rightarrow$. We denote by V the universe of sets which satisfies the Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the axiom of choice (ZFC). Throughout this paper, we fix the language $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ for first-order theory with equality having a binary relation symbol $\in$, bounded quantifier symbols $\forall x \in y$, $\exists x \in y$, and no constant symbols. For any class U , the language $\mathbf{L}(\in, U)$ is the one obtained by adding a name for each element of U . For convenience, we use the same symbol for an element of U and its name in $\mathbf{L}(\in, U)$ as well as for the membership relation and the symbol $\in$.

To each sentence ϕ of $\mathbf{L}(\in, U)$, the satisfaction relation $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \phi$ is defined by the following recursive rules:

1. $\langle U, \in \rangle \models u \in v$ iff $u \in v$.
2. $\langle U, \in \rangle \models u = v$ iff $u = v$.

3. $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \neg\phi$ iff $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \phi$ does not hold.
4. $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ iff $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \phi_1$ and $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \phi_2$.
5. $\langle U, \in \rangle \models (\forall x) \phi(x)$ iff $\langle U, \in \rangle \models \phi(u)$ for all $u \in U$.

We regard the other logical connectives and quantifiers as defined symbols. Our assumption that V satisfies ZFC means that if $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is provable in ZFC, i.e., $\text{ZFC} \vdash \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then $\langle V, \in \rangle \models \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ for any formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and all $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V$.

Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a logic. For each ordinal α , let

$$V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{Q})} = \{u \mid u : \mathcal{D}(u) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \text{ and } (\exists \beta < \alpha) \mathcal{D}(u) \subseteq V_\beta^{(\mathcal{Q})}\}.$$

The $\mathcal{Q}$ -valued universe $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ is defined by

$$V^{(\mathcal{Q})} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{On}} V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{Q})},$$

where On is the class of ordinals. It is easy to see that if $\mathcal{L}$ is a sublogic of $\mathcal{Q}$ then $V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{L})} \subseteq V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ for all α . For every $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, the rank of u , denoted by $\text{rank}(u)$, is defined as the least α such that $u \in V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. It is easy to see that if $u \in \mathcal{D}(v)$ then $\text{rank}(u) < \text{rank}(v)$.

For $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, we define the *support* of u , denoted by $L(u)$, by transfinite recursion on the rank of u with the relation

$$L(u) = \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{D}(u)} L(x) \cup \{u(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{D}(u)\}.$$

For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ we write $L(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{A}} L(u)$ and for $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ we write $L(u_1, \dots, u_n) = L(\{u_1, \dots, u_n\})$ and $L(\vec{u}) = L(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ if $\vec{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$. Then, we obtain the following characterization of subuniverses of $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a sublogic of $\mathcal{Q}$ and α an ordinal. For any $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, we have $u \in V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{L})}$ if and only if $u \in V_\alpha^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $L(u) \in \mathcal{L}$. In particular, $u \in V^{(\mathcal{L})}$ if and only if $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $L(u) \in \mathcal{L}$. Moreover, if $u \in V^{(\mathcal{L})}$ then $\text{rank}(u)$ defined in $V^{(\mathcal{L})}$ and the one defined in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ are the same.*

Proof. Immediate from transfinite induction on α . □

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. The *commutator* of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted by $\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A})$, is defined by

$$\underline{\vee}(\mathcal{A}) = \underline{\vee}L(\mathcal{A}).$$

For any $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, we write $\underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \underline{\vee}(\{u_1, \dots, u_n\})$ and $\underline{\vee}(\vec{u}) = \underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ if $\vec{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$.

In order to express the relation $\underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ for $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ by our object language, we introduce the n -ary predicate symbols $\underline{\vee}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in the language $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, and we denote by $\mathbf{L}(\in, \underline{\vee})$ and $\mathbf{L}(\in, \underline{\vee}, U)$ the languages adding $\underline{\vee}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for any $n = 1, 2, \dots$ to $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and $\mathbf{L}(\in, U)$, respectively, where U is a class of constant symbols.

To each sentence ϕ of $\mathbf{L}(\in, \underline{\vee}, V^{(\mathcal{Q})})$ we assign the $\mathcal{Q}$ -valued truth value $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ by the following recursive rules:

1. $\llbracket u = v \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket) \wedge \bigwedge_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \rightarrow \llbracket v' \in u \rrbracket).$
2. $\llbracket u \in v \rrbracket = \bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \wedge \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket).$
3. $\llbracket \bigvee(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket = \bigvee(u_1, \dots, u_n).$
4. $\llbracket \neg \phi \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket^\perp.$
5. $\llbracket \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket.$
6. $\llbracket \phi_1 \vee \phi_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket \vee \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket.$
7. $\llbracket \phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket.$
8. $\llbracket \phi_1 \leftrightarrow \phi_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi_1 \rrbracket \leftrightarrow \llbracket \phi_2 \rrbracket.$
9. $\llbracket (\forall x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u') \rrbracket).$
10. $\llbracket (\exists x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \bigvee_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \wedge \llbracket \phi(u') \rrbracket).$
11. $\llbracket (\forall x) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{u \in V(\mathcal{Q})} \llbracket \phi(u) \rrbracket.$
12. $\llbracket (\exists x) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \bigvee_{u \in V(\mathcal{Q})} \llbracket \phi(u) \rrbracket.$

We say that a sentence ϕ of $\mathbf{L}(\in, \bigvee, V^{(\mathcal{Q})})$ holds in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and write $V^{(\mathcal{Q})} \models \phi$ if $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket = 1$.

The de Morgan laws are satisfied as follows.

- (i) $\llbracket \neg(\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) \rrbracket = \llbracket \neg \phi_1 \vee \neg \phi_2 \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket \neg(\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2) \rrbracket = \llbracket \neg \phi_1 \wedge \neg \phi_2 \rrbracket.$
- (ii) $\llbracket \neg(\exists x) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\forall x) \neg \phi(x) \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket \neg(\forall x) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\exists x) \neg \phi(x) \rrbracket.$

However, it is only in the case where the generalized implication $\rightarrow$ is the maximum implication $\rightarrow_0$ that we have the de Morgan law for bounded quantifiers:

- (iii) $\llbracket \neg(\exists x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\forall x \in u) \neg \phi(x) \rrbracket, \quad \llbracket \neg(\forall x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\exists x \in u) \neg \phi(x) \rrbracket.$

According to the theory of Boolean-valued models for set theory [3], for any complete Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$ the Boolean-valued universe $V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ is defined in the same way as $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ for $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{B}$. Then, since $P \rightarrow Q = P^\perp \vee Q$ for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{B}$, it is easy to see that our definition of the truth value $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ coincides with the definition in the theory of Boolean-valued models for any sentence ϕ in $\mathbf{L}(\in, V^{(\mathcal{B})})$, if ϕ does not contain bounded quantifier $(\forall x \in y)$ or $(\exists x \in y)$. The next proposition shows that even for bounded quantifiers we have no conflict.

Proposition 6.2. *If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a Boolean logic, for any formula $\phi(x)$ of $\mathbf{L}(\in, V^{(\mathcal{Q})})$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\forall x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket &= \llbracket (\forall x) x \in u \rightarrow \phi(x) \rrbracket, \\ \llbracket (\exists x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket &= \llbracket (\exists x) x \in u \wedge \phi(x) \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. According to the theory of Boolean valued models, if $\mathcal{Q}$ is Boolean, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\forall x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket &= \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u') \rrbracket) = \bigwedge_{u' \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} (\llbracket u' \in u \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u') \rrbracket) \\ &= \llbracket (\forall x) x \in u \rightarrow \phi(x) \rrbracket, \\ \llbracket (\exists x \in u) \phi(x) \rrbracket &= \bigvee_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \wedge \llbracket \phi(u') \rrbracket) = \bigvee_{u' \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} (\llbracket u' \in u \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket \phi(u') \rrbracket) \\ &= \llbracket (\exists x) x \in u \wedge \phi(x) \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following theorem is an important consequence of the axiom of choice [3, Lemma 1.27]

Theorem 6.3 (Boolean Maximum Principle). *If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a Boolean logic, for any formula $\phi(x)$ of $\mathbf{L}(\in, V^{(\mathcal{Q})})$, there exists some $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ such that*

$$\llbracket \phi(u) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\exists x) \phi(x) \rrbracket.$$

The basic theorem on Boolean-valued universes is the following [3, Theorem 1.33].

Theorem 6.4 (Boolean Transfer Principle). *If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a Boolean logic, for any formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and all $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$, if $ZFC \vdash \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ then $V^{(\mathcal{Q})} \models \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n)$.*

A formula in $\mathbf{L}(\in, \underline{\vee})$ is called a Δ_0 -formula if it has no unbounded quantifier $\forall x$ or $\exists x$. For a sublogic $\mathcal{L}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ and a sentence ϕ in $\mathbf{L}(\in, \underline{\vee}, V^{(\mathcal{L})})$, we denote by $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}}$ the truth value of ϕ defined through $V^{(\mathcal{L})}$.

Theorem 6.5 (Δ_0 -Absoluteness Principle). *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a sublogic of a logic $\mathcal{Q}$. For any Δ_0 -sentence ϕ of $\mathbf{L}(\in, \underline{\vee}, V^{(\mathcal{L})})$, we have $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$.*

Proof. The assertion is proved by the induction on the complexity of formulas and the rank of elements of $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. Let $u, v \in V^{(\mathcal{L})}$. We assume that the assertion holds for all $u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)$ and $v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)$. Then, we have $\llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} = \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket$, $\llbracket v' \in u \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} = \llbracket v' \in u \rrbracket$, and $\llbracket u = v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} = \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket u = v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} &= \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}}) \wedge \bigwedge_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \rightarrow \llbracket v' \in u \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}}) \\ &= \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket) \wedge \bigwedge_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \rightarrow \llbracket v' \in u \rrbracket) \\ &= \llbracket u = v \rrbracket, \end{aligned}$$

and we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket u \in v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} &= \bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \wedge \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}}) \\ &= \bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \wedge \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket) \\ &= \llbracket u \in v \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

For any $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{L})}$, we have $\llbracket \underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}} = \llbracket \underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket$ from Propositions 3.3 and 6.1. Thus, the assertion holds for atomic formulas. Any induction step adding a logical symbol works easily, even when bounded quantifiers are concerned, since the ranges of the supremum and the infimum are common for evaluating $\llbracket \dots \rrbracket_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\llbracket \dots \rrbracket$. $\square$

The universe V can be embedded in $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ by the following operation $\vee : v \mapsto \check{v}$ defined by the $\in$ -recursion: for each $v \in V$, $\check{v} = \{\check{u} \mid u \in v\} \times \{1\}$. Then we have the following.

Theorem 6.6 (Δ_0 -Elementary Equivalence Principle). *For any Δ_0 -formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V$, we have $\langle V, \in \rangle \models \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ if and only if $\llbracket \phi(\check{u}_1, \dots, \check{u}_n) \rrbracket = 1$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{2}$ be the sublogic such that $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$. Then, by induction it is easy to see that $\langle V, \in \rangle \models \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n)$ if and only if $\llbracket \phi(\check{u}_1, \dots, \check{u}_n) \rrbracket_{\mathbf{2}} = 1$ for any $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$, and this is equivalent to $\llbracket \phi(\check{u}_1, \dots, \check{u}_n) \rrbracket = 1$ for any Δ_0 -formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ by the Δ_0 -absoluteness principle. $\square$

Proposition 6.7. *For any $u, v \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, the following relations hold.*

- (i) $\llbracket u = v \rrbracket = \llbracket v = u \rrbracket$.
- (ii) $\llbracket u = u \rrbracket = 1$.
- (iii) $u(x) \leq \llbracket x \in u \rrbracket$ for any $x \in \mathcal{D}(u)$.

Proof. Relation (i) is obvious from symmetry of the definition. We shall prove relations (ii) and (iii) by transfinite induction on the rank of u . The relations trivially hold if u is of the lowest rank. Let $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. We assume that the relations hold for those with lower rank than u . Let $x \in \mathcal{D}(u)$. By induction hypothesis we have $\llbracket x = x \rrbracket = 1$, so that we have

$$\llbracket x \in u \rrbracket = \bigvee_{y \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(y) \wedge \llbracket x = y \rrbracket) \geq u(x) \wedge \llbracket x = x \rrbracket = u(x).$$

Thus, assertion (iii) holds for u . Then, we have $(u(x) \rightarrow \llbracket x \in u \rrbracket) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathcal{D}(u)$, and hence $\llbracket u = u \rrbracket = 1$ follows. Thus, relations (ii) and (iii) hold by transfinite induction. $\square$

In Ref. [26, 27], Titani and a coworker constructed the lattice-valued universe $V^{(\mathcal{L})}$ for any complete lattice $\mathcal{L}$ in the same way as Boolean-valued universes and developed a lattice-valued set theory with implication $\rightarrow_T$ and negation $\neg_T$ defined by $P \rightarrow_T Q = 1$ if $P \leq Q$, $P \rightarrow_T Q = 0$ otherwise, and $\neg_T P = 1$ if $P = 0$, $\neg_T P = 0$ otherwise, for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}$. This theory can be applied to complete orthomodular lattices, but the implication $\rightarrow_T$ does not generally satisfy the requirements for generalized implications, in particular (LB), and the negation $\neg_T$ is different from the orthocomplementation. Although this theory includes the case where $\mathcal{L}$ is a complete Boolean algebra $\mathcal{B}$, the truth value defined in this theory is different from the one defined in the theory of Boolean-valued models, if $\mathcal{B} \neq \mathbf{2}$, contrary to the present theory.

7 Transfer Principle in Quantum Set Theory

Throughout this section, let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a logic with a generalized implication $\rightarrow$. Let $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $p \in \mathcal{Q}$. The *restriction* $u|_p$ of u to p is defined by the following transfinite recursion:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(u|_p) &= \{x|_p \mid x \in \mathcal{D}(u)\}, \\ u|_p(x|_p) &= u(x) \wedge p \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{D}(u)$. By induction, it is easy to see that if $q \leq p$, then $(u|_p)|_q = u|_q$ for all $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$.

Proposition 7.1. *For any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $p \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have*

$$L(\{u|_p \mid u \in \mathcal{A}\}) = L(\mathcal{A}) \wedge p.$$

Proof. By induction, it is easy to see the relation $L(u|_p) = L(u) \wedge p$, so that the assertion follows easily. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. The *logic generated by $\mathcal{A}$* , denoted by $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$, is define by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) = L(\mathcal{A})^{\sharp}.$$

For $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, we write $\mathcal{Q}(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \mathcal{Q}(\{u_1, \dots, u_n\})$.

Proposition 7.2. *For any Δ_0 -formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, we have $\llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{Q}(u_1, \dots, u_n)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$. Since $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$, it follows from Proposition 6.1 that $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}))}$. By the Δ_0 -absoluteness principle, we have $\llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket = \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$. $\square$

Proposition 7.3. *For any Δ_0 -formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, if $p \in L(u_1, \dots, u_n)^!$, then $p \downarrow \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket$ and $p \downarrow \llbracket \phi(u_1|_p, \dots, u_n|_p) \rrbracket$.*

Proof. Let $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$. If $p \in L(u_1, \dots, u_n)^!$, then $p \in \mathcal{Q}(u_1, \dots, u_n)^!$. From Proposition 7.2, $\llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{Q}(u_1, \dots, u_n)$, so that $p \downarrow \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket$. From Proposition 7.1, $L(u_1|_p, \dots, u_n|_p) = L(u_1, \dots, u_n) \wedge p$, and hence $p \in L(u_1|_p, \dots, u_n|_p)^!$, so that $p \downarrow \llbracket \phi(u_1|_p, \dots, u_n|_p) \rrbracket$. $\square$

We define the binary relation $x_1 \subseteq x_2$ by “ $x_1 \subseteq x_2$ ” = “ $\forall x \in x_1 (x \in x_2)$.” Then, by definition for any $u, v \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ we have

$$\llbracket u \subseteq v \rrbracket = \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket,$$

and we have $\llbracket u = v \rrbracket = \llbracket u \subseteq v \rrbracket \wedge \llbracket v \subseteq u \rrbracket$.

Proposition 7.4. *For any $u, v \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $p \in L(u, v)^!$, we have the following relations.*

- (i) $\llbracket u|_p \in v|_p \rrbracket = \llbracket u \in v \rrbracket \wedge p$.
- (ii) $\llbracket u|_p \subseteq v|_p \rrbracket \wedge p = \llbracket u \subseteq v \rrbracket \wedge p$.
- (iii) $\llbracket u|_p = v|_p \rrbracket \wedge p = \llbracket u = v \rrbracket \wedge p$

Proof. We prove the relations by induction on the ranks of u, v . If $\text{rank}(u) = \text{rank}(v) = 0$, then $\mathcal{D}(u) = \mathcal{D}(v) = \emptyset$, so that the relations trivially hold. Let $u, v \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $p \in L(u, v)^!$. To prove (i), let $v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)$. Then, we have $p \downarrow v(v')$ by the assumption on p . By induction

hypothesis, we have also $\llbracket u|_p = v'|_p \rrbracket \wedge p = \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket \wedge p$. By Proposition 7.3, we have $p \circ \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket$, so that $v(v'), \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket \in \{p\}^!$, and hence $v(v') \wedge \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket \in \{p\}^!$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket u|_p \in v|_p \rrbracket &= \bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v|_p)} v|_p(v') \wedge \llbracket u|_p = v' \rrbracket \\
&= \bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} v|_p(v'|_p) \wedge \llbracket u|_p = v'|_p \rrbracket \\
&= \bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \wedge p) \wedge (\llbracket u = v' \rrbracket \wedge p) \\
&= \left(\bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} (v(v') \wedge \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket) \wedge p \right) \\
&= \left(\bigvee_{v' \in \mathcal{D}(v)} v(v') \wedge \llbracket u = v' \rrbracket \right) \wedge p,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 2.2. Thus, by definition of $\llbracket u = v \rrbracket$ we obtain the relation $\llbracket u|_p \in v|_p \rrbracket = \llbracket u = v \rrbracket \wedge p$, and relation (i) has been proved. To prove (ii), let $u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)$. Then, we have $\llbracket u'|_p \in v|_p \rrbracket = \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket \wedge p$ by induction hypothesis. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket u|_p \subseteq v|_p \rrbracket &= \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u|_p)} (u|_p(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v|_p \rrbracket) \\
&= \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u|_p(u'|_p) \rightarrow \llbracket u'|_p \in v|_p \rrbracket) \\
&= \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \wedge p \rightarrow (\llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket \wedge p)).
\end{aligned}$$

We have $p \circ u(u')$ by assumption on p , and $p \circ \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket$ by Proposition 7.3, so that $p \circ u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket$ and $p \circ (u(u') \wedge p) \rightarrow (\llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket \wedge p)$. Thus, by Proposition 4.4 (ii) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
p \wedge \llbracket u|_p \subseteq v|_p \rrbracket &= p \wedge \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \wedge p \rightarrow (\llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket \wedge p)) \\
&= p \wedge \bigwedge_{u' \in \mathcal{D}(u)} (u(u') \rightarrow \llbracket u' \in v \rrbracket) \\
&= p \wedge \llbracket u \subseteq v \rrbracket.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have proved relation (ii). Relation (iii) follows easily from relation (ii). $\square$

Theorem 7.5 (Δ_0 -Restriction Principle). *For any Δ_0 -formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ and $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, if $p \in L(u_1, \dots, u_n)^!$, then $\llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket \wedge p = \llbracket \phi(u_1|_p, \dots, u_n|_p) \rrbracket \wedge p$.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by induction on the complexity of $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. From Proposition 7.4, the assertion holds for atomic formulas. Then, the verification of every induction step follows from the fact that (i) the function $a \mapsto a \wedge p$ of all $a \in \{p\}^!$ preserves

the supremum and the infimum as shown in Proposition 2.2, (ii) it satisfies $(a \rightarrow b) \wedge p = [(a \wedge p) \rightarrow (b \wedge p)] \wedge p$ for all $a, b \in \{p\}^!$ from the defining property of generalized implications, (iii) it satisfies relation (ii) of Theorem 4.4, and that (iv) it satisfies the relation $a^\perp \wedge p = (a \wedge p)^\perp \wedge p$ for all $a, b \in \{p\}^!$. $\square$

We use the following abbreviations. Let $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), \vec{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$.

$$\forall \vec{x} \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \forall x_1, \dots, \forall x_n \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m).$$

$$\exists \vec{x} \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \exists x_1, \dots, \exists x_n \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m).$$

$$\forall \vec{x} : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) = \forall \vec{x} \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \rightarrow \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n).$$

$$\exists \vec{x} : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) = \exists \vec{x} \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \wedge \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n).$$

Then, we have the following transfer principle that transfers a theorem of ZFC to a valid sentences on $V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$.

Theorem 7.6 (Transfer Principle). *Let $\phi(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n)$ be a Δ_0 -formula in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$, where $\vec{x}_j = (x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_{m(j)}^{(j)})$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. If $Q_1 \vec{x}_1, \dots, Q_n \vec{x}_n \phi(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n)$ is provable in ZFC, where $(Q_1, Q_2, \dots) = (\forall, \exists, \dots)$ or $(Q_1, Q_2, \dots) = (\exists, \forall, \dots)$, then we have the following.*

$$(i) \quad V^{(\mathcal{Q})} \models Q_1 \vec{x}_1 : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1) \cdots Q_n \vec{x}_n : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \phi(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n).$$

$$(ii) \quad V^{(\mathcal{Q})} \models Q_1 \vec{x}_1 \cdots Q_n \vec{x}_n (\underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n) \rightarrow \phi(\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_n)).$$

Proof. We will first prove statement (i). To give a basic idea for the general proof, we shall first give a proof for a Σ_3 formula $\forall x \exists y \forall z \phi(x, y, z)$ in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ provable in ZFC. Let $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $p = \underline{\vee}(u)$. Then, $p \in L(u)^! \cap L(u)''$ and $L(u) \wedge p \subseteq L(u)^! \cap L(u)''$ by Proposition 3.3. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a maximal Boolean sublogic of $\mathcal{Q}$ including $L(u)^! \cap L(u)''$. Then, $L(u|_p) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ by Proposition 7.1, and hence $u|_p \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ from Proposition 6.1. Since $\exists y \forall z \phi(x, y, z)$ is provable in ZFC, we have $\llbracket \exists y \forall z \phi(u|_p, y, z) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$ from the Boolean transfer principle (Theorem 6.4). By the Boolean maximum principle (Theorem 6.3), there exists $v' \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ such that $\llbracket \forall z \phi(u|_p, v', z) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$. Recall that for any $b \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists $u_b \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ such that $\mathcal{D}(u_b) = \{\emptyset\}$ and $u_b(\emptyset) = b$. Let $v \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ be such that $\mathcal{D}(v) = \mathcal{D}(v') \cup \{u_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}\}$ and $v(x) = \llbracket x \in v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{D}(v)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket v = v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} &= \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v)} v(x) \rightarrow \llbracket x \in v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \wedge \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v')} v'(x) \rightarrow \llbracket x \in v \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v)} \llbracket x \in v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \llbracket x \in v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \wedge \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v')} \left(v'(x) \rightarrow \bigvee_{y \in \mathcal{D}(v)} v(y) \wedge \llbracket x = y \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v')} \left(v'(x) \rightarrow \bigvee_{y \in \mathcal{D}(v)} v(y) \wedge \llbracket x = y \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \right) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v')} v'(x) \rightarrow (v(x) \wedge \llbracket x = x \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}}) \\ &\geq \bigwedge_{x \in \mathcal{D}(v')} v'(x) \rightarrow \llbracket x \in v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $\llbracket v = v' \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$ and $\llbracket \forall z \phi(u|_p, v, z) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$, so that $\llbracket \phi(u|_p, v, w') \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$ for all $w' \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$. By the definition of v , we have $L(v) = \mathcal{B}$ so that $\underline{v}(v) = 1$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq L(v, u)$. Since $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}$, we have $L(v, u)^! \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $\underline{v}(u, v) = \underline{v}(u) = p$ by Proposition 3.5. Let $w \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ and $q = \underline{v}(u, v, w)$. Then, we have $\mathcal{B} \subseteq L(u, v, w)$, $q \in \mathcal{B}$, and $q \leq p$. Thus, $w|_q \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}$ and $\llbracket \phi(u|_p, v, w|_q) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$. Since $\phi(x, y, z)$ is a Δ_0 -formula, we have $\llbracket \phi(u|_p, v, w|_q) \rrbracket = 1$ by the Δ_0 -absoluteness principle (Theorem 6.5). Since $q \leq p$, by the Δ_0 -restriction principle (Theorem 7.5) we have

$$\llbracket \phi(u, v, w) \rrbracket \wedge q = \llbracket \phi(u|_q, v|_q, w|_q) \rrbracket \wedge q = \llbracket \phi(u|_p, v, w|_q) \rrbracket \wedge q = q,$$

and consequently we have $q \leq \llbracket \phi(u, v, w) \rrbracket$. By the deduction theorem (Theorem 4.8), we have $q \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u, v, w) \rrbracket = 1$. Since $w \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\bigwedge_{\bar{w} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(u, v, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u, v, \bar{w}) \rrbracket = 1.$$

Since $v \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigvee_{\bar{v} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(u, \bar{v}) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\bar{w} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(u, \bar{v}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u, \bar{v}, \bar{w}) \rrbracket \right) \\ & \geq \underline{v}(u, v) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\bar{w} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(u, v, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u, v, \bar{w}) \rrbracket \right) \\ & \geq \underline{v}(v, u) \\ & = \underline{v}(u). \end{aligned}$$

By the deduction theorem, we have

$$\underline{v}(u) \rightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\bar{v} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(u, \bar{v}) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\bar{w} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(u, \bar{v}, \bar{w}) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u, \bar{v}, \bar{w}) \rrbracket \right) \right) = 1.$$

Since $u \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\bigwedge_{\bar{u} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(\bar{u}) \rightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\bar{v} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(\bar{v}, \bar{u}) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\bar{w} \in V^{(\mathcal{Q})}} \underline{v}(\bar{v}, \bar{w}, \bar{u}) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(\bar{v}, \bar{w}, \bar{u}) \rrbracket \right) \right) = 1.$$

We have therefore shown the relation

$$V^{(\mathcal{Q})} \models \forall x : \underline{v}(x) \exists y : \underline{v}(x, y) \forall z : \underline{v}(x, y, z) \phi(x, y, z).$$

This completes the proof of (i) for Σ_3 -formula $\forall x \exists y \forall z \phi(x, y, z)$. Now, we shall prove (i) for a Π_{2n} -formula

$$\forall \vec{x}_1 \exists \vec{x}_2 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n})$$

in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ provable in ZFC.

(1) Let $\vec{u}_1 = (u_1^{(1)}, \dots, u_{m(1)}^{(1)}) \in (V^{(\mathcal{Q})})^{m(1)}$ and $p_1 = \underline{\vee}(\vec{u}_1)$. Then, $p_1 \in L(\vec{u}_1)^! \cap L(\vec{u}_1)^{!!}$ and $L(\vec{u}_1) \wedge p_1 \subseteq L(\vec{u}_1)^! \cap L(\vec{u}_1)^{!!}$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a maximal Boolean sublogic of $\mathcal{Q}$ including $L(\vec{u}_1)^! \cap L(\vec{u}_1)^{!!}$. Then, we have $\vec{u}_1[p_1] \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(1)}$, where $\vec{u}[p] = (u_1|_p, \dots, u_m|_p)$ for $\vec{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ and $p \in \mathcal{Q}$. From the Boolean transfer principle, we have

$$\llbracket \exists \vec{x}_2 \forall \vec{x}_3 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{x}_2, \vec{x}_3, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1.$$

(2) By the Boolean maximum principle, there exists $\vec{v}_2 = (v_1^{(2)}, \dots, v_{m(2)}^{(2)}) \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(2)}$ such that $\llbracket \forall \vec{x}_3 \exists \vec{x}_4 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{v}_2, \vec{x}_3, \vec{x}_4, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$. Let $\vec{u}_2 \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(2)}$ be such that $\mathcal{D}(u_k^{(2)}) = \mathcal{D}(v_k^{(2)}) \cup \{u_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}\}$ and $u_k^{(2)}(x) = \llbracket x \in v_k^{(2)} \rrbracket$ for all $x \in \mathcal{D}(u_k^{(2)})$ and all $k = 1, \dots, m(2)$. Then, we have $\llbracket u_k^{(2)} = v_k^{(2)} \rrbracket = \llbracket u_k^{(2)} = v_k^{(2)} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, m(2)$ as before, so that we have

$$\llbracket \forall \vec{x}_3 \exists \vec{x}_4 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{x}_3, \vec{x}_4, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1. \quad (16)$$

We have $L(\vec{u}_2) = \mathcal{B}$ and $L(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2) = L(\vec{u}_1) \cup \mathcal{B}$. Let $p_2 = \underline{\vee}(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2)$. Then, $p_2 \leq p_1$. On the other hand, we have $p_1 \in L(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2)^!$ and $L(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2) \wedge p_1 \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. Thus, by the maximality of p_2 we have $p_1 = p_2$.

(3) Let $\vec{u}_3 \in (V^{(\mathcal{Q})})^{m(3)}$ and $p_3 = \underline{\vee}(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3)$. Since $L(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3) \supseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is a maximal Boolean sublogic, we have $p_3 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $L(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3) \wedge p_3 \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ from Proposition 3.5, so that $\vec{u}_3[p_3] \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(3)}$. From Eq. (16), we have

$$\bigwedge_{\vec{v}_3 \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(3)}} \llbracket \exists \vec{x}_4 \forall \vec{x}_5 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{v}_3, \vec{x}_4, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1.$$

so that, we have

$$\llbracket \exists \vec{x}_4 \forall \vec{x}_5 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{x}_4, \vec{x}_5, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1.$$

(4) By the Boolean maximal principle, there exists $\vec{u}_4 \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(4)}$ such that

$$\llbracket \forall \vec{x}_5 \exists \vec{x}_6 \cdots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} \exists \vec{x}_{2n} \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \vec{x}_5, \vec{x}_6, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1.$$

Then, we have $L(\vec{u}_4) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $L(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_4) = L(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3)$, so that $\underline{\vee}(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_4) = \underline{\vee}(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3)$.

(5) Repeating analogous arguments, we can show that there exists a maximal Boolean sublogic $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \vec{u}_1 \in (V^{(\mathcal{Q})})^{m(1)} \exists \vec{u}_2 \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(2)} \forall \vec{u}_3 \in (V^{(\mathcal{Q})})^{m(3)} \exists \vec{u}_4 \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(4)} \cdots \\ \cdots \forall \vec{u}_{2n-1} \in (V^{(\mathcal{Q})})^{m(2n-1)} \exists \vec{u}_{2n} \in (V^{(\mathcal{B})})^{m(2n)} \\ \text{(i)} \quad L(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2j-1}) = L(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2j}) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n, \\ \text{(ii)} \quad p_1 = p_2 \geq p_3 = p_4 \geq \cdots \geq p_{2n-1} = p_{2n}, \\ \text{where } p_j = \underline{\vee}(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, 2n, \\ \text{(iii)} \quad \vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n-1}], \vec{u}_{2n} \in V^{(\mathcal{B})}, \\ \text{(iv)} \quad \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n-1}], \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket_{\mathcal{B}} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

By the Δ_0 -absoluteness principle, condition (iv) above can be replaced by the condition

$$\llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n-1}], \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket = 1.$$

(6) From condition (iii) above, we have $L(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n-1}], \vec{u}_{2n}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, and hence $p_{2n} \in L(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n-1}], \vec{u}_{2n})^!$. Since $p_{2n} \in L(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n})^!$, by the Δ_0 -restriction principle, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_{2n} &= p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_1], \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3[p_3], \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n-1}], \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket \\ &= p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1[p_{2n}], \vec{u}_2[p_{2n}], \vec{u}_3[p_{2n}], \vec{u}_4[p_{2n}], \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}[p_{2n}], \vec{u}_{2n}[p_{2n}]) \rrbracket \\ &= p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3, \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$p_{2n} \leq \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3, \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket. \quad (17)$$

(7) From condition(ii) we have $p_{2n-1} = p_{2n}$, and hence we have

$$p_{2n-1} \leq p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket.$$

Since $\vec{u}_{2n}$ was arbitrary, by taking the supremum over all $\vec{u}_{2n} \in V(\mathcal{Q})$, we have

$$p_{2n-1} \leq \bigvee_{\vec{u}_{2n} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket.$$

By the deduction theorem, we have

$$p_{2n-1} \rightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\vec{u}_{2n} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket \right) = 1.$$

Since $\vec{u}_{2n-1}$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\bigwedge_{\vec{u}_{2n-1} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_{2n-1} \rightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\vec{u}_{2n} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket \right) = 1.$$

(8) Now, repeating analogous arguments, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge_{\vec{u}_1 \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_1 \rightarrow & \left(\bigvee_{\vec{u}_2 \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_2 \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\vec{u}_3 \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_3 \rightarrow \left(\bigvee_{\vec{u}_4 \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_4 \wedge \dots \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{\vec{u}_{2n-1} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_{2n-1} \rightarrow \right. \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \left(\bigvee_{\vec{u}_{2n} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} p_{2n} \wedge \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{u}_3, \vec{u}_4, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket \right) \right) \dots \right) \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathcal{Q}) \models \forall \vec{x}_1 : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1) \exists \vec{x}_2 : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) \dots \forall \vec{x}_{2n-1} : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}) \\ \exists \vec{x}_{2n} : \underline{\vee}(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}) \phi(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_{2n-1}, \vec{x}_{2n}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have proved the assertion for Π_{2n} formulas for any n .

(9) The proof for Σ_{2n-1} formulas is easily obtained by modifying paragraph (1) above so that the symbol $\vec{x}_1$ is eliminated with $\forall \vec{x}_1$ and the maximal Boolean sublogic $\mathcal{B}$ is chosen arbitrary. The proofs for Π_{2n-1} formulas and Σ_{2n-2} formulas are easily obtained by modifying paragraph (4) so that the symbol $\vec{x}_{2n}$ is simply eliminated with $\forall \vec{x}_{2n}$. This completes the proof of (i).

(10) The proof of (ii) can be obtained for Π_{2n} formulas by modifying paragraph (7) as follows. From the last equation of paragraph (6), we have

$$p_{2n} \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket = 1.$$

Then taking supremums and infimums over $\vec{u}_1, \dots, \vec{u}_n$ we obtain

$$\bigwedge_{\vec{u}_1 \in V(\mathcal{Q})} \bigvee_{\vec{u}_2 \in V(\mathcal{Q})} \cdots \bigwedge_{\vec{u}_{2n-1} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} \bigvee_{\vec{u}_{2n} \in V(\mathcal{Q})} (p_{2n} \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \dots, \vec{u}_{2n-1}, \vec{u}_{2n}) \rrbracket) = 1.$$

This proves (ii) for Π_{2n} formulas. Modifications for other types of formulas are now obvious, and the proof is completed. $\square$

The following statement was previously proved for the case where $\mathcal{Q}$ is the projection lattice of a von Neumann algebra with the implication $\rightarrow_3$ (Sasaki arrow) [20].

Corollary 7.7 (Δ_0 -Transfer Principle). *Let $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a Δ_0 -formula in $\mathbf{L}(\in)$ provable in ZFC. Then, for any $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V(\mathcal{B})$ we have*

$$\underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \leq \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket.$$

Proof. By assumption $\forall x_1, \dots, \forall x_n \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is provable in ZFC, so that from the transfer principle we have

$$\bigwedge_{u_1, \dots, u_n \in V(\mathcal{Q})} \underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket = 1.$$

Let $u_1, \dots, u_n \in V(\mathcal{Q})$. Then, $\underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rightarrow \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket = 1$. Since $\underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \circ \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket$, we conclude

$$\underline{\vee}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \leq \llbracket \phi(u_1, \dots, u_n) \rrbracket.$$

$\square$

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 20654010 and No. 21244007 of the JSPS.

References

- [1] H. Araki, *Type of von Neumann algebras associated to the free field*, Prog. Theoret. Phys. **32** (1964), 956–965.
- [2] ———, *Mathematical theory of quantum fields*, International Series of Monographs on Physics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
- [3] J. L. Bell, *Boolean-valued models and independence proofs in set theory*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1985.
- [4] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, *The logic of quantum mechanics*, Ann. Math. **37** (1936), 823–845.
- [5] ———, *The logic of quantum mechanics*, Ann. Math. **37** (1936), 823–845.
- [6] G. Bruns and G. Kalmbach, *Some remarks on free orthomodular lattices*, Proc. Lattice Theory Conf. (Houston, U.S.A.) (J. Schmidt, ed.), 1973, pp. 397–408.
- [7] G. Chevalier, *Commutators and decompositions of orthomodular lattices*, Order **6** (1989), 181–194.
- [8] P. J. Cohen, *The independence of the continuum hypothesis I*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **50** (1963), 1143–1148.
- [9] ———, *Set theory and the continuum hypothesis*, Benjamin, New York, 1966.
- [10] P. A. M. Dirac, *The principles of quantum mechanics*, 4th ed. ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1958.
- [11] M. P. Fourman and D. S. Scott, *Sheaves and logic*, Applications of Sheaves: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Applications of Sheaf Theory to Logic, Algebra, and Analysis, Durham, July 9-21, 1977 (M. P. Fourman, C. J. Mulvey, and D. S. Scott, eds.), Lecture Notes in Math. **753**, Springer, Berlin, 1979, pp. 302–401.
- [12] G. M. Hardegree, *Material implication in orthomodular (and Boolean) lattices*, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic **22** (1981), 163–182.
- [13] L. Herman, E. L. Marsden, and R. Piziak, *Implication connectives in orthomodular lattices*, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic **16** (1975), 305–328.
- [14] K. Husimi, *Studies on the foundation of quantum mechanics I*, Proc. Physico-Mathematical Soc. Japan **19** (1937), 766–778.
- [15] P. T. Johnstone, *Topos theory*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, vol. 10, Academic Press, London, 1977.
- [16] G. Kalmbach, *Orthomodular lattices*, Academic, London, 1983.
- [17] J. Kotas, *An axiom system for the modular logic*, Studia Logica **21** (1967), 17–38.

- [18] E. L. Marsden, *The commutator and solvability in a generalized orthomodular lattice*, Pacific J. Math **33** (1970), 357–361.
- [19] F. J. Murray and J. von Neumann, *On rings of operators*, Ann. of Math. (2) **37** (1936), 116–229.
- [20] M. Ozawa, *Transfer principle in quantum set theory*, J. Symbolic Logic **72** (2007), 625–648.
- [21] S. Pulmannová, *Commutators in orthomodular lattices*, Demonstratio Math. **18** (1985), 187–208.
- [22] M. Rédei (ed.), *John von Neumann: Selected letters*, History of Mathematics, vol. 27, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 2005.
- [23] R.J.Grayson, *Heyting-valued models for intuitionistic set theory*, Applications of Sheaves: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Applications of Sheaf Theory to Logic, Algebra, and Analysis, Durham, July 9-21, 1977 (M. P. Fourman, C. J. Mulvey, and D. S. Scott, eds.), Lecture Notes in Math. 753, Springer, Berlin, 1979, pp. 402–414.
- [24] D. Scott and R. Solovay, *Boolean-valued models for set theory*, unpublished manuscript for *Proc. AMS Summer Institute on Set Theory*, Los Angeles: Univ. Cal., 1967.
- [25] G. Takeuti, *Quantum set theory*, Current Issues in Quantum Logic (E. G. Beltrametti and B. C. van Fraassen, eds.), Plenum, New York, 1981, pp. 303–322.
- [26] S. Titani, *A lattice-valued set theory*, Arch. Math. Logic **38** (1999), 395–421.
- [27] S. Titani and H. Kozawa, *Quantum set theory*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **42** (2003), 2575–2602.
- [28] A. Urquhart, *Review*, J. Symbolic Logic **48** (1983), 206–208.
- [29] J. von Neumann, *Continuous geometry*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960.